

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated August 1, 2003, the Examiner objects to the specification and claims 1, 5 and 6 because of informalities. The Examiner rejects claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph. Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,149,441 (Pellegrino et al.) in view of US 2002/0015052 (Anderson et al.).

Specification Objections

The disclosure has been objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended the specification to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 5 and 6 have been objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

Claim 8 has been rejected because the Examiner asserts that no useful, concrete and tangible result is produced. Applicants have amended this claim to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pellegrino et al. in view of Anderson et al.

Pellegrino et al. discloses a computer-based educational system for use by teacher and student users and includes a server computer and at least one client computer having a display and user input device. A lesson builder allows teachers to create customized lessons incorporating lesson material that includes text, audio, images, video and application programs into a lesson for delivery to the student user. Lesson material can be presented in a lesson directly or as a link, such that the student is presented with the material at the student's option. Students may access the Internet during execution of the lesson, and may collaborate with other students, as well as the teacher.

Anderson et al. discloses an on-line educational system where an instructor builds a course on-line containing identification of assignments and educational materials, which are compiled into an on-line electronic syllabus. Users enrolled in the course may access the electronic syllabus and perform various functions with the on-line educational system in order to participate in the on-line educational course.

An editor tool permits instructors or others to dynamically change, modify and edit educational courses for the on-line educational courses. An interface facilitates the creation and editing of the content between a user and the database for the on-line educational system.

Regarding claims 1, 6, 7 and 8, Applicants submit that neither Pellegrino et al. nor Anderson et al., taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, an activity model data representative of a set of roles including a role which relates to the learner transmitting the request, or an operation interpretation table to be used for interpreting the request as behaviors between the resources, or an operation table for storing a correspondence between an operation request and a behavior name, or an activity bottle made of a set of role names and a set of links representative of behaviors between role names. The Examiner asserts that Pellegrino et al. discloses an activity model data at col. 10, line 67 - col. 11, line 4. However, this portion of Pellegrino et al. merely discloses that the educational system identifies authorized users, ascribes a "type" to each user and permits access to certain features of the system depending on the "type" ascribed to the user. According to the present invention, "activity model data" relates to a link between a set of role names and a set of links indicating behaviors between the role names such as, for example, an "instruct" behavior from "teacher" to "leader", or a "teach" behavior from "teacher" to "learner" as shown in Fig. 1. In contrast, Pellegrino et al. discloses a user "type" as teacher, student, support and

administrative, etc. This is not activity model data representative of a set of roles, including a role that relates to the learner transmitting the request, a set of behaviors which can be performed by each of the roles, and another set of roles for which any of behaviors is to be performed, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, Pellegrino et al. discloses "feature" as meaning a "feature of the system" such as "changing user password", "receiving student log on information", etc. (see col. 10, lines 65-66). This is not an activity model data, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Pellegrino et al. discloses an operation interpretation table to be used for interpreting the request as behaviors between the resources, as being inherent in Pellegrino et al. at col. 10, line 67 - col. 11, line 4. However, this is the same portion of Pellegrino et al. that the Examiner asserts as disclosing an activity model data, and as noted previously, this portion merely discloses that the educational system identifies authorized users and ascribes a type to each user. An "operation interpretation table" as recited in the claims of the present application relates to a table for interpreting behaviors between resources, such as "show page: teach", "write page: teach" as shown in Fig. 1. This is not disclosed or suggested in this portion of Pellegrino et al. Later, the Examiner then admits that Pellegrino et al. does not disclose a role table and an operation interpretation table, as recited in the claims of the present application, but asserts that this would have been obvious in view of Anderson et al. which teaches tables to store information and associations between the tables, see page 3, paragraph

[0060]. However, Anderson et al. merely discloses an "association between tables" which indicates relationships among various tables as shown in Fig. 2A-2R.

Anderson et al. does not disclose or suggest an operation interpretation table as
recited in the claims of the present application. ✓

To help the Examiner better understand the present invention, according to the present invention, there is provided both an activity model data representative of a set of role names and a set of links indicating behaviors between the role names, and an operation interpretation table used for interpreting the operation between resources. By using such arranged system, it becomes possible (i) to control access right for a combination of role, behavior and object, as shown in Fig. 5; (ii) to change access right by changing activity model, without setting access right for both each of actual operations to resource and all the resources, as described on page 13, lines 1-4; and (iii) to control actual operations in resources only by preparing operation interpretation table for interpreting behaviors corresponding to such actual operations when any resource is added at a server end, as described in page 10, line 24 - page 11, line 13. Operation (i) through operation (iii) cannot be performed by means of any arrangement disclosed in Pellegrino et al. or Anderson et al.

Regarding claims 2-5, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither Pellegrino et al. nor Anderson et al., taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or

render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-8 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-8 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (referencing attorney docket no. 500.41128X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb
(703) 312-6600